

REMARKS

The above amendments and following remarks are fully and completely responsive to the Office Action dated July 26, 2005. Claims 1-6 are pending in this application with claims 2 and 5 amended and claim 1 canceled by the present Amendment. In the outstanding Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and claims 2-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). No new matter has been added. Claims 1-6 are presented for consideration.

35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Diamant et al. (WO 99/42915, "Diamant"). In making this rejection, the Office Action asserts that this reference teaches each and every element of the claimed invention. The cancellation of claim 1 renders this rejection moot.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of Diamant and further in view of Wakayama (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,502). In making this rejection, the Office Action asserts that the combination of these two references teaches and/or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully disagrees and requests reconsideration of this rejection.

Independent claim 2 recites in part:

... a main control device conducting a certification and control of data;

a first buffer connected to the first channel;

a second buffer connected to said main control device, the second buffer storing a request or data;

a first switch, said first switch connects and disconnects said first buffer and said second buffer;

a second switch, said second switch connects and disconnects said main control device and the second channel; and ...

The Office Action asserts that the controller 1122 of Diamant is the main control device for conducting a certification and control of data. The Office Action also asserts that the public area 1128 of storage unit 1124 is the first buffer connected to the first channel. The Office Action further asserts that Diamant teaches that the secured area 1130 of storage unit 1124 is connected to the main control device (controller 1122).

In contrast, Diamant teaches that both the public area 1128 and the secured area 1130 are part of storage unit 1124. Storage unit 1124 is connected to the disk drive I/O 1120 on device 1100. The managing controller 1122 of the device 1100 connects one of the secured area 1130 or the public area 1128 to the computer 1102 depending on whether the computer user selected the secured mode or the public mode of operation. The controller 1122 of device 1100 also provides a command to either communication switch 1140 or communication switch 1142 to connect the computer to either secured network 1134 or public network 1136, respectively. The computer is only connected to one network at a time.

When the computer is connected to the public network, controller 1120 also connects the computer to the public area 1128 of storage unit 1124. However, none of

controller 1122, device 1100, or computer 1102 connect public network 1136 to the public area 1128 of storage unit 1124.

Similarly, the secured area 1130 of storage unit 1124 is connected via controller 1122 to computer 1102. The secured network 1134 is connected to computer 1102 with switching unit 1140. However, none of controller 1122, computer 1102, or switch 1130 connect the secured area 1130 of storage unit 1124 to secured network 1134.

The Office Action asserts that communication switch 1142 is the recited first switch. Communication switch 1142 connects the public network 1136 to computer 1102. However, switch 1142 does not connect the public area 1128 (first buffer) of storage unit 1124 to the secured area 1130 (second buffer) of storage unit 1124. In fact, Diamant teaches that at no time is the public area 1128 connected to secured area 1130 since this would compromise the security of the secured area 1130. Consequently, Diamant fails to teach and/or suggest that the first switch connects and disconnects the first buffer and the second buffer on the first channel.

The Office Action asserts that Diamant teaches that the second switch connects and disconnects the main control device and the second channel. The Office Action asserts that Diamant teaches controller 1122 as the main control device. However, switching unit 1140 does not connect the secured network 1134 to controller 1122. Instead, switching unit 1140 connects the secured network 1134 to the computer 1102. Similarly, switching unit 1142 fails to connect controller 1122 to public network 1136. Instead, switching unit 1142 connects public network 1136 to computer 1102. Therefore, Diamant fails to teach and/or suggest that the second switch connects and disconnects the main control device and the second channel.

The Office Action admits that Diamant fails to teach and/or suggest a control device conducting a certification. The Office Action cites Wakayama as correcting this deficiency in Diamant. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that data pump 27 or 30 is a control device that conducts a certification. Each of data pumps 27 and 30 contains an operating system, an anti-virus program, and a photocoupler control system that is stored in read-only memory. The anti-virus program certifies that the data stored in the random access memory is free from viruses.

The anti-virus program disclosed in Wakayama, that certifies the data free from viruses, requires the ability to isolate the random access memory from both the link keeper 20 and the server 37. This isolation requires the use of two photocouplers 35 and 36 or 33 and 34. In contrast, Diamant discloses the use of a single switch to connect either the public network 1136 to computer 1102 or to connect the secured network 1134 to computer 1102. Consequently, a person of ordinary skill in the art would have no motivation to include the anti-virus program contained in the data pump 27 or 30 in either switching unit 1140 or 1142. Therefore, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not combine these two references in the manner suggested in the Office Action.

Additionally, Wakayama is neither cited for, nor corrects, the deficiencies discussed above in Diamant.

Even if these two references were combined (Applicant continues to assert that one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine these two references) the combination of these two references fails to teach and/or suggest the claimed invention. Specifically, the combination of these two references fails to teach and/or suggest a first buffer

connected to the first channel. The combination of these references also fails to teach and/or suggest that the first switch connects and disconnects the first buffer and the second buffer on the first channel. The combination of these two references also fails to teach and/or suggest that the second switch connects and disconnects the main control device and the second channel. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendments and remarks have overcome the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated July 26, 2005. Specifically, Applicant's cancellation of claim 1 renders moot the rejection of this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a). Applicant's remarks have distinguished claims 2-6 from the cited prior art and thus overcome the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, claims 2-6 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of claims 2-6.

Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney by telephone if it is believed that such contact will expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge payment for any additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300, making reference to attorney docket number 027497-00001.

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX PLLC



Rustan J. Hill
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,351

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RJH/elz

TECH/325908.1